

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

In response to the Office Action dated April 6, 2006, Applicants provisionally elect Group I, directed to Claims 1-13. If the present restriction requirement is not withdrawn or modified, Applicants respectfully request examination of the invention of Group I.

Applicants traverse the restriction requirement, as it appears to be an incorrect characterization of the claims. In particular, Claim 14, directed to Group II, is recognized in the Office Action as being a "linking claim" that links the inventions of Group I and Group III. The undersigned respectfully submits that Claim 14 is a generic claim and the proper action is for Applicants to elect a species. Moreover, the outstanding Office Action recognizes that if Claim 14 is allowed, then all of the other claims in the application will be rejoined and entered as a matter of right. Thus, to facilitate examination, Applicants elect the species of Group I and II, recognizing that Claim 14 is a generic claim with regard to the claims of Group I.

In view of the above discussion, if the present restriction requirement is not modified examination of Claims 1-13 and new Claim 23, is respectfully requested. New Claim 23 corresponds to Claim 14, but is of the same statutory class as that of the claims in Group I and therefore should be examined with the Claims of Group I recognizing that the subject matter of Claim 14 is generic to that of Claims 1-13.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000

Fax: (703) 413 -2220

(OSMMN 06/04)

I:\ATTY\BOL\285\282563US\282563US.RESTAM_050806.DOC

Scott A. McKeown
Reg. No. 42,836